

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended as set forth above to clarify several features associated with the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections set forth in the current Office Action. Applicants believe that the cited references are being misinterpreted as further set forth below.

I. Examiner Interview Dated December 5, 2008.

An interview was held on December 5, 2008. An agreement as to allowability was not reached. Applicants do believe that an agreement was reached that the current changes push the application forward over the cited references. Reconsideration is requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-13, 15-16, 19-24, 26-29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,127,473 issued to Agassi et al. (hereinafter "Agassi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,636 issued to Pandit (hereinafter "Pandit"). Claims 17, 18, 25, 33, 40, 41, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agassi in view of Pandit and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0007464 published to Balani (hereinafter "Balani"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections. Independent claim 1 includes the following combination of features that is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

accessing a client-side application of the client device to generate a client manipulative electronic document on the client side application;

parsing the text of the electronic document, **by a persona menu application located on the client device**, for a person name, wherein the persona menu application is separate from the client-side application;

querying, by the persona menu application, at least one data source containing person-centric data to identify person-centric data associated with the person name;

obtaining, at the persona menu application, person-centric data associated with the person name from the at least one initial data source;

querying, by the persona menu application, at least one subsequent data source containing person-centric data to identify additional person-centric data associated with the person-centric data obtained from the initial data source;

obtaining, at the persona menu application, the additional person-centric data from the at least one subsequent data source, wherein a communication application for communicating with a user identified by the person name is associated with at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source;

populating, in the client-side application of the client, a data structure for the person name with the person-centric data obtained from the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source; and

providing a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document of the client-side application, wherein the graphical user interface of the separate persona menu application includes action items for facilitating communication with the user identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.

As indicated, independent claim 1 recites “accessing a client-side application of the client device to generate a client manipulative electronic document on the client side application”. The specification includes several non-limiting examples of such client-side applications and client manipulative electronic documents. For example, the specification recites that the client-side applications may include an email application, a calendaring application, a word processing application, a collaborative application, etc. (See specification at page 7, line 22 – page 8, line 14).

Claim 1 continues by reciting “parsing the text of the electronic document, by a persona menu application located on the client device, for a person name, wherein the persona menu application is separate from the client-side application.” As indicated, the persona menu application is located on the client device and the persona menu application is separate from the

client-side application. The separate persona menu application that is located on the client parses the text of the electronic document generated by the client side application of the client.

Claim 1 further continues to recite “querying, by the persona menu application, at least one subsequent data source containing person-centric data to identify additional person-centric data associated with the person-centric data obtained from the initial data source,” and “obtaining, at the persona menu application, the additional person-centric data from the at least one subsequent data source, wherein a communication application for communicating with a user identified by the person name is associated with at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.” As indicated, the separate persona menu application that is located on the client is querying a subsequent data source to identify additional person-centric data associated with the person-centric data obtained from the initial data source. The additional person-centric data is obtained on the separate persona menu application that is located on the client.

Claim 1 continues by reciting “providing a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document of the client-side application, wherein the graphical user interface of the separate persona menu application includes action items for facilitating communication with the user identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.” As indicated, the separate persona menu application provides a graphical user interface in the client-side application of the client device.

As one example of the advantages of the above features, information that is not indicated by the person name (e.g., the name identified by the parsing) may be obtained. For example, a name may be identified. The name may be used to query a contact database to obtain a phone number and email address for the name. The contacts database may not include a work supervisor associated with the name. Furthermore, a company directory may identify employees by an email address, so a query of the company database with the name will not return any

information. However, once the contact information is obtained (which includes the email address) the directory can be queried with the email address to return the work supervisor. In this manner, the data received from each query can be leveraged for additional queries to obtain as much relevant information from the databases that are associated with the name without having to use the name as the identifier for each query. Again, as indicated above, the persona menu application is a separate application on the client device. This provides the persona menu application the advantage of being able to associate with a plurality of applications and a plurality of database types to provide a rich and extensible set of contact centric data associated with a name identified in a document as indicate. The independence of the separate persona menu application allows for the population and leveraging from information gathered from multiple data sources.

The cited references do not teach or otherwise suggest the combination of features associated with independent claim 1. Agassi is teaching an interface associated with iView portals. The portals include document information from several sources that are populated on a user interface. Agassi teaches a system for delivering the portals to a user. The portals are generated on an Internet server and then delivered to the user. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 43-46). The user interface is a collection of the portals that are selected by the user to be updated by the web server when the interface is selected. As an example, a search engine (i.e., Yahoo) may have portals associated with it. The user can select content to be displayed on the home page and the content is updated when the page is rendered or refreshed. Such a web service associated with the portals cannot be analogized to the client side application and the separate persona menu application that are located on the client device. Moreover, Agassi teaches that “it should be understood that the difference between a portal system, as that term is used herein...is that...[they] are generally ‘query’ systems, in which data is obtained in a reactive manner.” (Agassi at col. 7, lines 22-34). Agassi continues by stating that “it should be understood that the article (that is, the content) within the iView 305 did not necessarily exist before user 210 logged onto system 205.” (Agassi, at col. 8, lines 50-54). Agassi is teaching a webpage of portals in a system where the portals are sent to the user from a web server. Agassi does not teach the combination as indicated.

The Office Action contends that Agassi teaches considering all the content displayed upon the display (primary and supplemental article generated based upon the content of the article) to be one article for the purpose of generating supplemental content therefrom. (Office Action at 4). This proposition is not found in Agassi. Agassi is teaching the term “article” may include several articles associated with the iView. Agassi is stating that for purposes for “generating” the supplemental information data associated with each of the iViews may be considered as one. Again, the data generated is for each of the initial articles. The consideration of the separate iViews as one is to allow the supplemental information to pertain and be filtered for the entire interface and not just one separate iView. Agassi is not making the point that the supplemental information is collected to generate another set of supplemental information as propounded in the Office Action. In fact, such an occurrence would be contrary to Agassi’s position that the display pane for the supplemental information is limited and is filtered to the most relevant supplemental data that is related to the initial articles. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 56-65; col. 10, lines 16-25). Throughout Agassi, Agassi indicates that the supplemental content is for the content of the primary articles.

Agassi also fails to teach “providing a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document of the client-side application...”. As stated, Agassi does not teach a separate persona menu application that provides a graphical user interface for a client side application in the client. Again, Agassi relates to a portal environment of an Internet server.

Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in any of the other references that remedies the lack of teaching in Agassi. Furthermore, Agassi’s portal system is teaching directly away from the systems used in the other references. Any combination would be detrimental to Agassi. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 26 includes the following combination of features that is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

accessing a client-side application of the client device to generate a client manipulative electronic document on the client-side application;

parsing the text of the electronic document, by a persona menu application located on the client device, for an electronic mail address associated with a person name, wherein the persona menu application is separate from the client-side application;

querying, by the persona menu application, at least one initial data source containing person-centric data to identify person-centric data associated with the electronic mail address;

obtaining, at the persona menu application, person-centric data associated with the person name from the at least one initial data source;

querying, by the persona menu application, at least one subsequent data source containing person-centric data to identify additional person-centric data associated with the person-centric data obtained from the initial data source;

obtaining, at the persona menu application, the additional person-centric data associated with the person name from the at least one subsequent data source, wherein a communication application for communicating with a user identified by the person name is associated with at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source;

populating, in the client-side application of the client device, a data structure for the person name with the person-centric data obtained from the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source;

labeling the person name in the electronic document to indicate available functionality;

upon user selection of the labeled person name, providing a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document of the client-side application, wherein the graphical user interface of the separate persona menu application includes action items for facilitating communication with the user identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.

The cited references do not teach or otherwise suggest the combination of features associated with independent claim 26. Agassi is teaching an interface associated with iView portals. The portals include document information from several sources that are populated on a user interface. Agassi teaches a system for delivering the portals to a user. The portals are generated on an Internet server and then delivered to the user. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 43-46). The user interface is a collection of the portals that are selected by the user to be updated by the web server when the interface is selected. As an example, a search engine (i.e., Yahoo) may have portals associated with it. The user can select content to be displayed on the home page and the content is updated when the page is rendered or refreshed. Such a web service associated with the portals cannot be analogized to the client side application and the separate persona menu application that are located on the client device. Moreover, Agassi teaches that “it should be understood that the difference between a portal system, as that term is used herein...is that...[they] are generally ‘query’ systems, in which data is obtained in a reactive manner.” (Agassi at col. 7, lines 22-34). Agassi continues by stating that “it should be understood that the article (that is, the content) within the iView 305 did not necessarily exist before user 210 logged onto system 205.” (Agassi, at col. 8, lines 50-54). Agassi is teaching a webpage of portals in a system where the portals are sent to the user from a web server. Agassi does not teach the combination as indicated.

The Office Action contends that Agassi teaches considering all the content displayed upon the display (primary and supplemental article generated based upon the content of the article) to be one article for the purpose of generating supplemental content therefrom. (Office Action at 4). This proposition is not found in Agassi. Agassi is teaching the term “article” may include several articles associated with the iView. Agassi is stating that for purposes for “generating” the supplemental information data associated with each of the iViews may be considered as one. Again, the data generated is for each of the initial articles. The consideration of the separate iViews as one is to allow the supplemental information to pertain and be filtered for the entire interface and not just one separate iView. Agassi is not making the point that the supplemental information is collected to generate another set of supplemental information as propounded in the Office Action. In fact, such an occurrence would be contrary to Agassi’s

position that the display pane for the supplemental information is limited and is filtered to the most relevant supplemental data that is related to the initial articles. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 56-65; col. 10, lines 16-25). Throughout Agassi, Agassi indicates that the supplemental content is for the content of the primary articles.

Agassi also fails to teach “upon user selection of the labeled person name, providing a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document of the client-side application, wherein the graphical user interface of the separate persona menu application includes action items for facilitating communication with the user identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.” As stated, Agassi does not teach a separate persona menu application that provides a graphical user interface for a client side application in the client. Again, Agassi relates to a portal environment of an Internet server.

Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in any of the other references that remedies the lack of teaching in Agassi. Furthermore, Agassi’s portal system is a teaching directly away from the systems used in the other references. Any combination would be detrimental to Agassi. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 26 is allowable.

Independent claim 34 includes the following combination of features that is not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

a computer operative to operate at least one application program module and to display at least one electronic document and graphical user interfaces;

a client-side application program *of a client device* operative to receive, in a client manipulative electronic document, at least one member of a group comprising; text and data;

a persona menu application program located on the client device separate from the client-side application operative;

to parse the electronic document for an email address associated with a person name;

to recognize the person name from text or data in which the person name is included, when no electronic mail address is available for the person name in the electronic document;

to query a contacts database for an unique identification associated with the person name when the at least one data source does not contain person-centric data matching an electronic mail address;

to obtain a unique identification at the contacts database;

to pass the unique identification to at least one initial data source containing person-centric data;

to parse the at least one data source for obtaining person-centric data associated with the person name;

to query at least one subsequent data source containing person-centric data to identify additional person-centric data associated with the person-centric data obtained from the initial data source;

to obtain additional person-centric data associated with the person name from the at least one subsequent data source, wherein a communication application for communicating with a user identified by the person name is associated with at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source;

to populate, in the client-side application, a data structure for the person name with the person-centric data obtained from the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source;

to labeling the person name in the electronic document to indicate available functionality; and

to provide a graphical user interface, **of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays** the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document, upon user selection of the labeled person name, wherein the graphical user interface **of the separate persona menu application** includes action items for facilitating communication with the user

identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source.

The cited references do not teach or otherwise suggest the combination of features associated with independent claim 34. Agassi is teaching an interface associated with iView portals. The portals include document information from several sources that are populated on a user interface. Agassi teaches a system for delivering the portals to a user. The portals are generated on an Internet server and then delivered to the user. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 43-46). The user interface is a collection of the portals that are selected by the user to be updated by the web server when the interface is selected. As an example, a search engine (i.e., Yahoo) may have portals associated with it. The user can select content to be displayed on the home page and the content is updated when the page is rendered or refreshed. Such a web service associated with the portals cannot be analogized to the client side application and the separate persona menu application that are located on the client device. Moreover, Agassi teaches that “it should be understood that the difference between a portal system, as that term is used herein...is that...[they] are generally ‘query’ systems, in which data is obtained in a reactive manner.” (Agassi at col. 7, lines 22-34). Agassi continues by stating that “it should be understood that the article (that is, the content) within the iView 305 did not necessarily exist before user 210 logged onto system 205.” (Agassi, at col. 8, lines 50-54). Agassi is teaching a webpage of portals in a system where the portals are sent to the user from a web server. Agassi does not teach the combination as indicated.

The Office Action contends that Agassi teaches considering all the content displayed upon the display (primary and supplemental article generated based upon the content of the article) to be one article for the purpose of generating supplemental content therefrom. (Office Action at 4). This proposition is not found in Agassi. Agassi is teaching the term “article” may include several articles associated with the iView. Agassi is stating that for purposes for “generating” the supplemental information data associated with each of the iViews may be considered as one. Again, the data generated is for each of the initial articles. The consideration of the separate iViews as one is to allow the supplemental information to pertain and be filtered

for the entire interface and not just one separate iView. Agassi is not making the point that the supplemental information is collected to generate another set of supplemental information as propounded in the Office Action. In fact, such an occurrence would be contrary to Agassi's position that the display pane for the supplemental information is limited and is filtered to the most relevant supplemental data that is related to the initial articles. (Agassi at col. 6, lines 56-65; col. 10, lines 16-25). Throughout Agassi, Agassi indicates that the supplemental content is for the content of the primary articles.

Agassi also fails to teach "to provide a graphical user interface, of the separate persona menu application, in the client-side application of the client device, wherein the graphical user interface displays the person-centric data and the additional person-centric data adjacent to the person name in the electronic document, upon user selection of the labeled person name, wherein the graphical user interface of the separate persona menu application includes action items for facilitating communication with the user identified by the person name according to the communication application associated with the at least one member of a group comprising: the at least one initial data source and the at least one subsequent data source." As stated, Agassi does not teach a separate persona menu application that provides a graphical user interface for a client side application in the client. Again, Agassi relates to a portal environment of an Internet server.

Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in any of the other references that remedies the lack of teaching in Agassi. Furthermore, Agassi's portal system is a teaching directly away from the systems used in the other references. Any combination would be detrimental to Agassi. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 34 is allowable.

The dependent claims include features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, those claims ultimately depend from the independent claims set forth above. As such, they should be found allowable for at least those same reasons.

III. Request for Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is

App. No. 10/606,578
Amendment Dated: January 7, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2008

respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



RYAN T. GRACE

Registration No. 52,956

Direct Dial: 402.344.3000

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
612.332.5300

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE